

R E M A R K S

In the non-final Office Action dated February 13, 2008, it is noted that claims 1 – 12 are pending; that the drawings are objected to; that the specification is objected to; that claims 1 – 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101; that claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112; that claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102; and that claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In the present amendment, claims 1 – 12 have been amended to clarify one or more aspects of the present claimed invention. No new matter has been added.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the labeled rectangular boxes shown in the drawings do not have descriptive text labels. In the attached Replacement Drawing Sheet, Applicants have added descriptive text labels to the rectangular boxes. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specifications

The specification has been objected to for not being broken into sections with corresponding section headings.

Applicants thank the Examiner for providing information about recommended section headings. However, applicants respectfully decline to add the headings. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC §111(a), but per 37 CFR §1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77").

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1 – 9, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In particular, the Office Action states that claims 1 – 9 are rejected as falling under the judicial exception of an abstract idea which lacks a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Applicants submit that claims 1 – 9, as amended, have a useful, concrete, and tangible result, because there is an output (search result) produced in response to an input (search request).

Regarding claim 11, the Office Action states that the claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants submit that claim 11, as amended, has the necessary physical articles, because there are a request interface for input (search result) and an organizational device for output (search request).

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, the Office Action states that these claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform to current U.S. practice, and that they replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. In the present amendment, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to conform to current U.S. practice. Applicants submit that all claims are now definite.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 – 4, 6 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Beattie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,742).

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 12 are not anticipated by Beattie et al.

For example, amended claim 1 requires that “*said search request comprises at least one representation-describing feature distinct from content-describing features.*”

The support for the present claim amendment can be found in specification, page 3, lines 11 – 13.

The Office Action of February 13, 2008, page 7, states that Beattie et al., column 12, lines 17 – 26, discloses:

“The search query represents a topic, issue or question about which the user desires to locate information. In the preferred embodiment, the search query is provided by the user in a natural language format. Thus, for example, if the user wants to locate relevant sources of information indicating how many soldiers were killed in Vietnam, the user might enter the query, "How many soldiers were killed in Vietnam." The query may be entered in the form of a complete sentence, or as phrase or sentence fragment, such as, "Vietnam casualties".”

Applicants respectfully submit that this teaching of Beattie et al. does not correspond to the “representation-describing” feature as claimed. Although the query “How many soldiers were killed in Vietnam” is phrased in natural language format, it is nevertheless a “content-describing” query, i.e., the search looks for articles that exhibit in their content information about the number of soldiers killed in Vietnam. Beattie et al. does not teach any “representation-describing” feature that is distinct from the content description. In contrast, the claimed invention requires a “representation-describing” feature, for example, it can be the representation of documentary material described by the type of language used (childish language or adult

language), which is distinct from the content description. Thus, a search for the information about the number of soldiers killed in Vietnam, supplemented by a “representation-describing” feature initiated by a child would result in articles about Vietnam War casualties, written in language suitable for children. Using the query taught by Beattie et al. would not generate the same search result because these articles would not generally be identified with the headword “childish language”. Therefore, Beattie et al. does not teach or suggest “*said search request comprises at least one representation-describing feature distinct from content-describing features,*” as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Beattie et al. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Applicants’ independent claim 11 includes several similar distinguishing features as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments for claim 1 and applies them to claim 11 pointing out why claim 11 is not anticipated by Beattie et al.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 – 10 and 12 are also believed to be patentable over Beattie et al., because they depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively, with each dependent claim containing further distinguishing features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 – 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is further requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beattie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,742) in view of Nolting (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,308).

Applicants submit that Nolting does not bridge in any way the feature gap between Beattie et al. and claim 1, therefore claim 5 should also be patentable because it depends from and inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Application Number: 10/556,002
Attorney Docket: DE 030159
Response to Office Action of February 13, 2008

Any fee due with this paper, not already paid through an EFS-Web filing, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-3894. Any overpayment may be credited to Deposit Account No. 50-3894.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS



By: Harris A. Wolin, Reg. No. 39,432
Attorney for the Applicants

Please Address All Correspondence to:

Yan Glickberg, Registration No. 51,742
Phone: (440) 483-3455
CUSTOMER NUMBER 24737